

Serial No.: 09/868,184

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 5-7, 8, 9, 10-12 and 13-64, as amended, remain herein.

Applicants appreciate the statements in the Office Action that claims 3, 4, 8, 9 and 13-42 are allowed.

Claims 1-4, 5-7, 8, 9, 10-12 and 13-64 have been amended to recite more clearly applicants' invention.

New claims 58-64 directed to other aspects of the invention have been added.

1. Applicants strongly object to the statement in the Office Action deeming claims 5-7 and 10-12 to be "withdrawn from consideration." There is no basis in the present record for withdrawing these claims from consideration. Claims 5-7 and 10-12 are not subject to any properly stated or suggested statutory a restriction requirement. Furthermore, claims 5-7 and 10-12, have been acted upon by the Examiner; those claims have been examined. Applicants request that examination of claims 5-7 and 10-12, continue herein.

Serial No.: 09/868,184

2. Objections were stated to claims 5-7 and 10-12. Claims 5, 7, 10 and 12 have been amended to remove multiple dependencies in the alternative form.

3. Claims 1, 2 and 43-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Okada et al. U.S. Patent 6,221,444 and Takenaka et al. U.S. Patent 6,473,077.

The presently claimed method and apparatus for driving a liquid crystal device to cause transition from a splay configuration to a bend configuration of a liquid crystal material by continuously applying a potential difference, different from a potential difference in a normal image display period, between the pixel electrode on the first substrate and the opposing electrode on the second substrate. This arrangement and corresponding method are nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited references.

The Office Action cites Okada '444 as allegedly disclosing a method and apparatus for driving a liquid crystal device to cause transition from a splay configuration of a liquid crystal layer to a bend configuration. Applicants disagree. Actually,

Serial No.: 09/868,184

Okada '444 discloses a liquid crystal element having a liquid crystal that needs no bend alignment in the liquid crystal material by application of a voltage. See Okada '444, column 2, lines 1-4, describing the Okada '444 liquid crystal having a bend alignment "which requires no electric field treatment for transforming play alignment to bend alignment." Okada '444 does not disclose, teach or suggest the idea of using existing transistor elements and wires for applying a potential difference for causing a bend alignment. The Office Action admits that Okada '044 does not disclose using two different driving signals, and cites Takenaka '077 as allegedly teaching same.

Takenaka '077 describes a passive matrix type liquid crystal display device for preventing the display image from becoming unclear due to an overlap of the afterimage of the display image of the preceding frame period with the display image of the current frame period. For that purpose, an image is written into at least one pixel line, and at the same time a black color is written into another pixel line. For that reason, Takenaka '077 applies two different driving signals.

Serial No.: 09/868,184

However, Takenaka '077 does not teach or suggest anything about quickly changing a splay alignment to a bend alignment in each pixel, much less applying two different driving signals to change a splay alignment to a bend alignment in each pixel. Takenaka '077 does not teach or suggest continuously applying a potential difference, different from a potential difference in a normal image display period, between the pixel electrode on the first substrate and the opposing electrode on the second substrate, as recited in applicants' claims.

There is no motivation stated, shown or suggested in Takenaka '077 teaching or suggesting application of two different driving signals to change a splay alignment to a bend alignment in each pixel of a liquid crystal device. Takenaka '077 also does not discuss the benefits or desirability of any such a combination. Such combination arises only in applicants' disclosure and cannot be found without improper hindsight reference to applicants' disclosure.

It would be completely antithetical to the Okada '444 disclosure to apply the arrangement taught by Takenaka '077 to a liquid crystal device wherein a potential is not applied to the

Serial No.: 09/868,184

liquid crystal material for transforming splay alignment into bend alignment, as in Okada '444.

Claims 54-57 are directed to expediting transition into a bend alignment, wherein the thickness of the liquid crystal layer above the gate line is reduced, thus applying higher field intensity to the liquid crystal layer located between the gate line and the opposing electrode. Neither Okada '444 nor Takenaka '077 discloses, teaches or suggests reduction of the gate line thickness for applying an increased field intensity to the liquid crystal layer located between the gate line and the opposing electrode.

For the foregoing reasons, neither Okada '444 nor Takenaka '077 contains any teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in either of these references that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claim 2, which depends from claim 1, is allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 1, and

Serial No.: 09/868,184

claims 43-57 are likewise allowable. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.


All claims 1-64 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection cited in the Office Action. Accordingly, allowance of all claims 1-64 is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

March 2, 2004
Date



Roger W. Parkhurst
Registration No. 25,177
Robert N. Wieland
Registration No. 40,225

RWP:RNW/mhs
Attorney Docket No.: OGO:082

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.
1421 Prince Street, Suite 210
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805
Telephone: (703) 739-0220